

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/648,702	LEGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Daniel A. Hess	2876	

**All Participants:**

(1) Daniel A. Hess.

(2) Brade Close.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 27 April 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*n/a*

**Claims discussed:**

*1, 18 and 20*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*n/a*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*Jared J. Fureman*

**JARED J. FUREMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner pointed out that the way the claims refer to the tags in the trunk portion of a tree and the base portion of the tree is confusing. In particular, it would be more clear if the claims referred to a 'first tag' and a 'second tag'. The Applicant agreed to suggest amended claims to remedy this confusion..